



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/734,015	12/12/2000	Johan Erik Lindstrom	004080-163	3752

27045 7590 05/07/2004

ERICSSON INC.
6300 LEGACY DRIVE
M/S EVR C11
PLANO, TX 75024

EXAMINER

WONG, BLANCHE

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2667	

DATE MAILED: 05/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/734,015

Applicant(s)

LINDSTROM ET AL.

Examiner

Blanche Wong

Art Unit

2667

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-92 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-92 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>#5/Mar26,01</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because Examiner fails to make a logical connections between the specification and figures.

For example, Fig. 1a and/or Fig. 1b fail to show media gateway (MG) as described in the specification on p.10, ln. 4. Examiner fails to make a logical connection between a media gateway in either of these figures as described in the specification and only to find the reference number 12 in Fig. 2. For clarity, Examiner suggests Applicant to include MG or 12 in Fig. 1a and/or 1b, or delay introduction of MG or 12 to the paragraph explaining Fig. 2.

Examiner suggests Application reviews the specification alongside with the figures in the application in its entirety for any similar confusion to avoid any future hindrance in the patent examining due process.

Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character "7" has been used to designate both controlling node (as shown in Fig. 1) and telecommunication system (as stated on p. 9, para. 5, ln. 1). Vice

versa, reference character "6" has been used to designate both controlling node (as stated on p.9, para. 5, ln. 1) and telecommunication system (as shown in Fig. 1). A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

3. This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.
4. The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC (See 37 CFR 1.52(e)(5) and MPEP 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text are permitted to be submitted on compact discs.) or
REFERENCE TO A "MICROFICHE APPENDIX" (See MPEP § 608.05(a). "Microfiche Appendices" were accepted by the Office until March 1, 2001.)
- (e) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.

(2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.

(f) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.

(g) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).

(h) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.

(i) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).

(j) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).

(k) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: syntax errors and incoherency.

Examples on p.1-10 are provided below for your reference. Examiner suggests Applicant review the application in its entirety for similar syntax errors and incoherency.

With regard to syntax errors:

p.1, para. 2, ln. 7-11, is an incomplete sentence. A subject and predicate are needed to complete a sentence.

p.1, para. 3, has no topic. If para. 3 is an example as suggested by the words "For example" that begins the paragraph, then para. 3, ln. 6-8, refers to one embodiment of the invention, and para. 3, ln. 9-11, refers to yet another embodiment of the invention, both of which are further examples of the invention in the example. The latter two examples are nested examples of the example and are embedded in the

same paragraph as the example. A topic sentence is needed to state a paragraph's intention.

p.2, para. 1, has no particularity. The paragraph begins with and refers to "The added new switches" but ends with and refers to "The global address space." In this paragraph, there is also "the traffic control functions." For clarity, each paragraph should have only one topic.

p.2, para. 2, ln. 11, "To summarize:" is unnecessary if there is a concluding sentence for a paragraph. The concluding sentence should refer back to the topic of the paragraph.

p.2, para. 3, ln. 1-2 refer to a conventional connection handler and ln. 3 refers to a functionality connection handler. Both connection handlers are functional in addition to the connection handler of the invention referred to in the beginning ln. 1 or the topic of the paragraph starting "The connection handler".

p.3, para. 1, ln. 4-6 does not explain what makes the call handler similar or different from a conventional call handler.

p.4, para. 3, ln. 2, a period should separate – switch – and – instead –, rather than a comma. Examiner suggests that Applicant check the specification in its entirety for all misleading punctuation.

p. 5, para. 2, "In order to fully understand the claims, the description and the merits of the invention some expressions must be clarified and some characteristics of the invention must be made clear" is a run-on one sentence paragraph, expresses a comment, and is a null reference. The point of this paragraph should be made clear.

p.5, under Definitions, only one definition for inlet is presented.

p.5, under Inventive features, features are cluttered together and no specific feature(s) to the invention can be identified.

p.7, para. 1, is a one sentence paragraph. The point of this paragraph should be made clear.

p. 7, para. 2. For clarity, each paragraph should have only one topic.

p.7, under Description of the drawings, labels should clearly identify the figures, and vice versa. Examiner suggests referencing some previous U.S. patents.

p. 8, ln. 5, has a miscellaneous question mark at the end. Examiner suggests that Applicant checks the specification in its entirety for all misleading punctuation.

p.8, ln. 21, "is a illustrating a file" is incomprehensible. Examiner suggests replacing with "illustrates" or "is an illustration of"

p.9, ln. 3 and ln. 8, if ln. 3 "illustrates the release of the call that was set up in FIG. 10," then how can ln. 8 "illustrates how the call set up in FIG. 12 is released." The call is released twice and no call in either Fig. 12 or 14 is being set up. Examiner suggests Applicant reviews the specification and application in its entirety for inconsistencies as such.

p.9, para. 1, covers four topics or features. For clarity, each paragraph should have only one topic.

With regard to incoherency:

p.3, para. 1, ln. 6-7 states that the call handler addresses all of the switches, existing as well as added ones. P. 2, para. 1, ln. 1 states that the added new switches are addressed by the traffic control functions. Therefore, the call handler performs the traffic control functions. Transitional words or phrases should be use to connect paragraphs with different topics. Examiner suggests consulting a writing guide and using a dictionary for transitional words and phrases.

p.10, para. 2, is a one sentence paragraph. The relationship of this paragraph should be made clear.

p.10, para. 3, expresses a comment. The point of this paragraph should be made clear.

Appropriate correction is required.

6. It would be a burden for the Examiner to list all possible objections. Examiner has given her best effort in the first 10 pages and provided sufficient objections that should reflect the type of changes or correction necessary to clarify the specification or disclosure and thus to allow the Examiner to proceed with patent examining due diligence. Furthermore, the Examiner is not an editor and a comprehensive writing errors cannot be provided.

7. Examiner has found that in general, the specification is very confusing as written and the disclosure of the invention is incomprehensive. Therefore, the invention is unfound.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

9. **Claim 1-92** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

With regard to claims 1-32, -- changing the existing node to a controlling node --, as recited in claim 1, is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Assuming there is only one existing node, how does an existing node change to a control node is not included in claim 1.

With regard to claims 33-64, -- which is used by the call layer --, as recited in claim 33, is not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Which or what (the existing node, a global address space, means for controlling all said switches, among other elements and limitations recited in claim 33) used by the call layer, is not included in claim 33.

With regard to claims 65-92, there is insufficient disclosure in the specification and in claims 1-64, to allow the Examiner to provide an accurate patent examination.

10. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

11. The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

12. **Claim 9** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

With regard to claim 9, "expresses" is unclear.

13. There is insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations in these claims:

Claim 2 recites the limitation "the entire additional switch" in ln. 2.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "the additional switch" whereas previous claims referred to "at least one additional switch", and the limitation "the number of inlets".

Claim 4 recites the limitation "the identity of the switch".

Claim 6 recites the limitation "the global addresses" whereas previous claims referred to "a global address space," the limitation "the same format", and the limitation "the local address" whereas in previous claims referred to "a local address space."

Claim 7 recites the limitation "the format".

Claim 8 recites the limitation "the individual inlet".

Conclusion

14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ayandeh (U.S. Pat No. 6,069,895) discloses a distributed route server.

Golikeri et al. (U.S. Pat No. 6,597,700) discloses a system, device, and method for address management in a distributed communication environment.

Kalmanek, JR. et. Al. (U.S. Pat No. 6,483,912) discloses a method for allocating network resources.

Madonna (U.S. Pat No. 6,522,646) discloses an expandable telecommunication system.

Yanagidate et al. (U.S. Pat No. 6,128,664) discloses an address-translation connection device.

15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Blanche Wong whose telephone number is 703-305-8963. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 830am to 530pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chi H Pham can be reached on 703-305-4378. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BW

BW
April 30, 2004



CHAU NGUYEN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600